

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 6, 2008, has been received and reviewed. In the Office Action, claims 1-33 were pending in the subject application. All claims were rejected. More specifically, claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kemp. et. al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0200291 (hereinafter “Kemp”). Claims 1, 10, 21 and 31 have been amended herein. Care has been exercised to introduce no new matter. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdeggal Brothers v. Union Oil co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 2 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). *See also*, MPEP § 2131.

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kemp. Applicants respectfully submit that Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the rejected claims, as amended herein. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, as hereinafter set forth.

As amended herein, independent claim 1 recites a system for automatic configuration upon installation of a network printer. The system comprises, in part, bi-directional application program interfaces that are configured to perform an auto-configuration

of the system upon installation of the network printer, the auto-configuration capable of being performed independent of input from one or more users at one or more client computers.

By way of contrast, Kemp is directed towards a web-based creation of printer instances on a workstation wherein a user must interact with a printers folder in order to install printer instances on a workstation-by-workstation basis. *See generally Kemp*. Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of a bi-directional application program that has an auto-configuration capable of being performed independent of input from one or more users at one or more client computers. Rather, Kemp discloses a method that requires a user to install necessary printer components by opening a printer folder on the user's computer and affirmatively selecting an URL link in order to select a local printer or a network printer to be installed on a computer. *See generally Kemp, Figure 5*. This is in direct contrast to the system disclosed in the present invention, wherein a network computer that has been installed or re-configured communicates with one or more client computers and automatically reconfigures the one or more client computers. *See Specification, Figure 6*. In addition, the Applicants' claimed invention automatically installs required printer components when the need for the components becomes apparent. *See Specification, [0031]*. As such, the method disclosed in Kemp, which requires a user to input a command to install a printer, is vastly different than the system claimed in independent claim 1, which recites an installed network printer that automatically configures client computers to be compatible with a printer.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of currently amended independent claim 1. Moreover, Kemp fails to show the identical invention in as complete detail as contained in the

claim. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Kemp. Therefore, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of this claim is respectfully requested.

For at least the above reasons, claims 2-9 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-9 be removed.

With reference to independent claim 10 amended herein, a system for facilitating client retrieval of bi-directional information upon installation of a network device is recited that comprises, in part, bi-directional constructs that are configured to monitor and recognize the acquiring of additional printer features, wherein the additional printer features are automatically updated when recognized.

Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of a method for installing printers comprising further monitoring or installation after the initial printer installation has been completed. Kemp discloses a system wherein a user must select an URL in order to install printer components related to a local printer or a network printer. Once a printer is installed onto an individual workstation, however, there is no indication of continuous monitoring or updating of printer components on a work station. This is in sharp contrast to a system of the Applicants' claimed invention, wherein bi-directional constructs are configured to monitor additional printer features. As such, Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of an auto-configuration where the auto-configuration provides for automatically updating the system upon installation of the network printer independent of user intervention.

As previously discussed, Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of a bi-directional application program that has an auto-configuration

capable of being performed independent of input from one or more users at one or more client computers, as required by independent claim 10, as amended herein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of currently amended independent claim 10. Moreover, Kemp fails to show the identical invention in as complete detail as contained in the claim. Thus, claim 10 is patentable over Kemp. Therefore, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of this claim is respectfully requested.

For at least the above reasons, claims 11-20 depend directly or indirectly from claim 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11-29 be removed.

With reference to claim 21, a method is recited for automatically configuring a system upon installation of a network printer within the system, wherein the system includes printer description files, a driver, a spooler, and a port monitor which comprises, in part, getting a list of installable features and corresponding bi-directional requests from the printer description files. In contrast, Kemp discloses a system wherein a user must select an URL in order to install printer components related to a local printer or a network printer. As such, Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of an auto-configuration of a system upon installation of a network printer, wherein the auto-configuration is capable of being performed independent of input from one or more users at one or more client computers, as required by independent claim 21, as amended herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of currently amended independent claim 21. Moreover, Kemp fails to show the identical invention

in as complete detail as contained in the claim. Thus, claim 21 is patentable over Kemp.

Therefore, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of this claim is respectfully requested.

For at least the above reasons, claims 22-30 depend directly or indirectly from claim 21. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 22-30 be removed.

With reference to claim 31, a method is recited for providing extensibility for a port monitor in order to enable vendors to define new mappings using existing public bi-directional schema and extensions to existing schema which comprises, in part, permitting the use of an extension file capable of describing a mapping between bi-directional values and device-specific objects, wherein the extension file is configured to provide for auto-configuration of a system, the auto-configuration including configuration of the system to recognize the device-specific objects and current configuration of the network printer. In contrast, Kemp discloses a system wherein a user must select an URL in order to install printer components related to a local printer or a network printer. As such, Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of an auto-configuration of a system upon installation of a network printer, wherein the auto-configuration is capable of being performed independent of input from one or more users at one or more client computers as required by independent claim 31, as amended herein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of currently amended independent claim 31. Moreover, Kemp fails to show the identical invention in as complete detail as contained in the claim. Thus, claim 31 is patentable over Kemp. Therefore, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of this claim is respectfully requested.

For at least the above reasons, claims 32-33 depend directly or indirectly from claim 31. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 32-33 be removed.

As Kemp fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of currently amended independent claims 1, 10, 21, and 31, and in light of Kemp's failure to show the identical invention in as complete detail as contained in amended independent claims 1, 10, 21, and 31, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable over Kemp. Each of claims 2-9, 11-20, 22-30, and 32-33 depends, either directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 10, 21, and 31 and is, accordingly, patentable over Kemp for at least the above-cited reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 2-9, 11-20, 22-30, and 33 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-33 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or lsearcy@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard Searcy, II/

Leonard Searcy, II
Reg. No. 53,574

LSZ/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550